

REMARKS

Applicants, by the amendments presented above and the arguments presented below, have made a concerted effort to present claims which clearly define over the prior art of record, and thus to place this case in condition for allowance. Claims 3-8, 12-20, 27, 44-47 and 49-56 are currently pending. Claims 1, 2, 9-11, 22-24, 26, 28-30, 32-35, 37-42, 48, 57 and 58 were cancelled herein. Claims 21, 25, 31, 36 and 43 were previously cancelled. Claims 3-5, 7, 8, 12, 13, 19, 20 and 49-56 have been amended herein.

Elections/Restrictions

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's withdrawing claims 22-24, 26 and 28 from consideration. In view of the present amendment, Applicant has cancelled claims 22-24, 26 and 28 herein. Applicant reserves the right to file divisional/continuing application(s) on all claims previously withdrawn or cancelled during the prosecution of this application.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 22. As claim 22 was withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner and now cancelled by Applicant, Applicant considers this objection to be moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated that claims 44-47 were allowed.

The Examiner further indicated that claims 4, 8, 13-18, 20, 27, 49, 50, 55 and 56 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that these claims would

Serial No.: 10/674,198
Art Unit: 3679

be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

In view thereof, Applicant has amended claim 4 into independent form to include all of the limitations of independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2 and 3. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of new independent claim 4. Applicant has also amended claim 8 into independent form to include all of the limitations of independent claim 1 and dependent claim 2. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of new independent claim 8. Applicant has further amended claim 13 into independent form to include all of the limitations of independent claim 10 and dependent claims 11 and 12. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of new independent claim 13. As claims 14-18 and 27 are all ultimately dependent upon claim 13, and as Applicant states that new independent claim 13 is in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 14-18 and 27. Applicant has also amended claim 20 into independent form to include all of the limitations of independent claim 10 and dependent claim 11. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of new independent claim 20. Applicant has further amended claim 49 into independent form to include all of the limitations of independent claim 1 and dependent claim 2. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of new independent claim 49. Applicant has also amended claim 50 into independent form to include all of the limitations of independent claim 10 and dependent claim 11. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of new independent claim 50. Applicant has further amended claim 55 into independent form to include all of the limitations of independent claim 29 and dependent claim

Serial No.: 10/674,198
Art Unit: 3679

33. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of new independent claim 55. Applicant has further amended claim 56 into independent form to include all of the limitations of independent claim 34 and dependent claim 38. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of new independent claim 56.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-12, 19, 29, 30, 32-35, 37-42, 51-54, 57 and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by United States Patent No. 2,258,342 to Tinnerman.

Applicant has cancelled claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 29, 30, 32-35, 37-42, 57 and 58 herein. Thus, Applicant considers the rejection of these claims to be moot.

Applicant has amended claim 3 to be dependent upon new independent claim 8, which Applicant states is in condition for allowance. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 3.

Applicant has amended claims 5, 7, 51 and 52 to be dependent upon new independent claim 4, which Applicant states is in condition for allowance. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 5, 7, 51 and 52. As claim 6 is dependent upon claim 5, Applicant further respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 6.

Applicant has amended claims 12 and 19 to be dependent upon new independent claim 20, which Applicant states is in condition for allowance. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 12 and 19.

Applicant has amended claims 53 and 54 to be dependent upon new independent claim

Serial No.: 10/674,198
Art Unit: 3679

19

13, which Applicant states is in condition for allowance. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 53 and 54.

Interview Summary

Applicant's attorney conducted an Interview with the Examiner on April 6, 2006. In view thereof, Examiner issued an Interview Summary Form on April 10, 2006 detailing the substance of the Interview. Applicant concurs with the Examiner's characterization of the substance of the interview, namely that:

1. The participants were Examiner Katherine W. Mitchell and James O'Malley;
2. The interview was conducted on April 6, 2006 via the telephone;
3. No exhibit was shown or demonstrated;
4. All of the claims were discussed, with claim 22 being separately discussed;
5. The prior art discussed was United States Patent No. 2,258,342 to Tinnerman;
6. It was not applicable whether an agreement was reached with respect to the claims; and
7. The substance of the interview related to Applicant inquiring whether an amendment to recite nut movement with respect to the cage in addition to the current limitations would overcome Tinnerman. The Examiner stated that it was her belief that the best art had been located, but that she might have to update the search and that it would be possible that a reference not previously found could read on the claims, but that it would be unlikely. With respect to claim 22, the Examiner stated that she believed there would be art directed to this claim, but that because this claim was withdrawn pursuant to restriction, she could not be sure.

Serial No.: 10/674,198
Art Unit: 3679

20

Applicant notes that the application has been amended in an attempt to place the application in condition for allowance at this time, rather than making further amendments to the independent claims, namely claims 1, 10, 29, 34, 39, 40, 41, 42, 57 and 58 which would generally require that the movement of the nut be with "respect to the cage member", as the Examiner indicated that such amendment would more than likely require the filing of a Request for Continued Examination, along with the required fee, for such claims to be examined and likely allowed. Applicant requests that if the Examiner does not feel it would be necessary to perform another search in view of such an amendment, that, if possible, the Examiner reinstate these independent claims and make the amendment to generally require that the movement of the nut be with "respect to the cage member" by Examiner's amendment.

In view of the above Amendments and Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of the application are allowable over the rejections of the Examiner. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, the Examiner is invited to contact one of the undersigned attorneys at (312) 704-1890.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5-2-06

By: Richard A. Scam
Richard A. Giangiori, Reg. No. 24,284
James A. O'Malley, Reg. No. 45,952
TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GIANGIORGI,
BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD.
105 W. Adams Street, 36th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60603
(312) 704-1890

961669